

Amendments to the Drawings:

Formal drawings are submitted herewith under Separate Letter to the Draftsperson. For the convenience of the Examiner, a copy of the formal drawings are also attached with this amendment.

Attachment: Replacement Figure 1

REMARKS

The Office Action dated March 8, 2005 has been received and reviewed by the applicant. Claims 1-4 are in the application. Claims 1-4 stand rejected. Claims 1-3 are amended. Reconsideration is respectfully request.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. In this regard, claims 1 and 2 are amended to as suggested by the rejection were to include the limitation that the Website is "tangibly embodied to on a computer readable medium."

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In this regard, antecedent basis is now added for the second link. It is respectfully requested that this rejection now be withdrawn.

It is noted that the specification was amended to correct a typographical error. This amendment now accurately describes Fig. 1.

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Microsoft PowerPoint (hereinafter PowerPoint, published in 1999 by Microsoft Corporation). In response, is noted that "section 102(b) may create a bar to patentability either alone, if the device used in public is an *anticipation* of a later claimed invention ..." (emphasis added) *Lough v. Brunswick Corp.*, 86 F.3d 1113, 39 USPQ2d 1100 (Fed. Cir. 1996). "For a prior art reference to anticipate in terms of 35 USC 102, every element of the claimed invention must be *identically shown in a single reference*. These elements must be arranged as in the claim under review." (emphasis added) *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990) In this regard, as will be shown hereinbelow, PowerPoint does not disclose each and every element of claims 1 and 3. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that a rejection under 35 USC 102(b) is inappropriate.

More specifically, claims 1 and 2 include the limitations of a Website and HTML pages. It is well known in the art that PowerPoint is not a Website, and it is also well known that PowerPoint is neither in HTML language nor does it include HTML pages. Consequently, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 be withdrawn.


In addition, Applicants wish to clearly point out the distinctions between the claimed invention and PowerPoint. As stated above, the claimed invention includes HTML pages, and PowerPoint is neither in HTML language nor does it include HTML pages. And it is also to be noted that, if PowerPoint were to be exported to a Website, the insertion of pages and any subsequent renumbering would *not* be permitted. In order to re-number any sequence pages, PowerPoint would have to be exported out of the Website and onto a desktop computer and then modified accordingly. Clearly the claimed invention includes an advantage of which the prior art is devoid.

Still further, the claimed invention is clearly directed to a "Website," and PowerPoint is limited solely to use on a desktop computer or laptop computer for creation and modification of PowerPoint slides. These are entirely different applications, and they are clearly not interchangeable as pointed out hereinabove. It is respectfully submitted that this is also clearly not anticipation and that the rejection be withdrawn.

Should the Examiner consider that additional amendments are necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the favor is requested of a telephone call to the undersigned counsel for the purpose of discussing such amendments.

For the reasons set forth above, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,


Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 36,390

Peyton C. Watkins/lam
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-477-8282
Facsimile: 585-477-4646

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.